

## REMARKS

### Objection

In claim 14, the Examiner's objects to the slash ("/") in the term "solvent/oil mixture". This is resolved by deletion of the term "solvent/oil". This deletion does not affect claim scope, because a previous phrase in the claim still specifies the "mixture" as being "of the solvent and the oil".

### Independent Claim 14

Claim 14, as amended, recites **two** oil extraction systems, each having its own solvent reservoir, extraction tank, distillation tank and return line. A common oil collection tank is connected simultaneously to both distillation tanks for collecting the oil from both distillation systems.

This is not suggested by the cited references to Walters and Haeefe. Neither reference suggests **two** extraction systems as claimed, much less a **common** oil collection tank connected simultaneously to both as claimed. Nor do the Examiner's citations from Walters (col. 4, lines 52-62) and Haeefe (col. 3, lines 61-62 and col. 7, lines 55-56) make any mention of these claim limitations.

Walters instead discloses only **one** system, with **no** oil collection tank at all (only an oil removal "conduit 106"). And Haeefe discloses **one** system, with its own reservoir, extraction tank, distillation tank, return line, and oil collection tank. Even if (despite no suggestion from the prior art to do so), the skilled person did double the number of Haeefe's extraction systems as the Examiner suggests, he still would not arrive at claim 14. That is because the skilled person would configure each Haeefe extraction system as Haeefe shows it -- with its own reservoir, extraction tank, distillation tank, return line, **and its own oil collection tank**, thereby rendering the claimed common oil collection tank unnecessary. The skilled person would not consider providing a **common** oil collection tank (to arrive at claim 14) when all the other system components are being doubled.

Therefore, claim 14 is patentable over the cited prior art.

### **Independent Claim 17**

Claim 17 recites a reservoir for holding solvent, an extraction tank for flowing the solvent through oil containing material to yield a solvent/oil mixture, a distillation tank for distilling off the solvent from the mixture, and a return line for returning the solvent to the reservoir. The solvent in the system can be replaced with a second solvent while the system remains closed to the atmosphere. Claim 17 is amended to clarify that the second solvent takes the place of the first solvent in being held by the reservoir, flowed through the material in the extraction tank, distilled from the distillation tank, and returned by the return line to the reservoir.

This is not suggested by the cited references to Walters, Haeferle and Marks. The only reference that discloses first and second solvents is Marks (which Marks calls a "desired solvent" and a "surrogate solvent"). And Marks' second solvent does not take the place of the first solvent as claimed, in that it is neither held by the reservoir (Marks' item 28) as claimed, flowed through the material in the extraction tank (12) as claimed, distilled from the distillation tank (24) as claimed, or returned to the reservoir (28) as claimed. Marks' second solvent takes the place of the first solvent only for permanently diluting the waste liquid (col. 11, lines 1-4), a function not even addressed in claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable over the cited prior art.

### **Dependent Claims 15-16**

The remaining claims depend from claim 14, which is patentable over the cited prior art as explained above. The limitations that the dependent claims add to claim 14 distinguish the dependent claims further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims, also, are patentable.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mitchell Rose (Reg. No. 47,906)  
JONES DAY  
901 Lakeside Ave.  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
(216)586-7094

Date: 7/5/07